

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

RICKEY BENSON,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	No. 2:23-cv-02584-SHL-atc
)	
FLOYD BONNER, JR.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Petitioner Rickey Benson filed a motion asking this Court to reconsider its order dated October 8, 2024. (ECF No. 24.) In that order, the Court denied his motion to consolidate his two appellate cases because his original motion was not properly before this Court. (ECF No. 23 at PageID 57.) The Court also denied his post-judgment motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal because it had already denied him a certificate of appealability, and Benson did not suggest any new reason the Court should rule differently. (*Id.* at PageID 57–58.) Nothing has changed since October 8, and Benson’s motion does not provide any point of law or fact overlooked by the Court.¹ Thus, his motion is **DENIED**.

¹ Benson’s motion is incomprehensible. (*See* ECF No. 24 at PageID 59.) He states that the Court violated his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights “by separating [his] motion from [his] complaint as a petition.” (*Id.*) He states that his motion “is about the defendant plotting to cause [his] hernia to kill [him], not about [his] burglary case.” (*Id.*) He asserts that this “separation” of his filings is grounds for a grant of certificate of appealability. (*Id.*) The Court previously denied one of Benson’s motions to add a claim that the healthcare staff at the prison was “plotting to cause [his] hernia to kill him.” (ECF No. 16 at PageID 39–40.) The Court informed him that his habeas petition was not an appropriate avenue for challenging the conditions of his incarceration. (ECF No. 16 at PageID 40.) Benson’s motion does not ask the Court to reconsider that order. (*See* ECF No. 23.)

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 29th day of January, 2025.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman
SHERYL H. LIPMAN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE